

OCT 11 2006

Serial No.: 10/089,399

Examiner: Jan M. Ludlow

Title: LIQUID HOMOGENIZING UNIT AND HIGH SPEED LIQUID CHROMATOGRAPH EQUIPPED WITH THE SAME

Page 6 of 7

REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1 and 13 have been revised to include the feature of claim 11. Claim 12 has been revised to depend from claim 1. The revisions are supported by the original disclosure. No new matter has been introduced. Claims 11 and 14-15 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 2, 6-10, 12-13, 16, 18 and 20 remain pending in the application. Claims 8, 10 and 18-19 have been withdrawn. Claims 3-4 were canceled in the AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE filed on March 1, 2006. Applicants note that the Office Action Summary Sheet lists claims 4-5 as pending and withdrawn.

Claim Rejection – 35 USC § 112

Claims 13-16 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, for informalities. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 13 has been editorially revised. Claims 14 and 15 have been canceled. Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-2, 6-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hrdina (US 3,520,517). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 1 has been revised to include the feature of claim 11, which the Examiner indicated to be allowable. Claims 2, 6-7 and 9 ultimately depend from claim 1 and thus are patentable along with claim 1. Applicants are not conceding the relevance of the references to the remaining features of the rejected claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-2, 6-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hrdina. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 1 has been revised to include the feature of claim 11, which the Examiner indicated to be allowable. Claims 2, 6-7 and 9 ultimately depend from claim 1 and thus are patentable along with claim 1.

Serial No.: 10/089,399
Examiner: Jan M. Ludlow
Title: LIQUID HOMOGENIZING UNIT AND HIGH SPEED LIQUID CHROMATOGRAPH EQUIPPED WITH THE SAME
Page 7 of 7

Applicants are not conceding the relevance of the references to the remaining features of the rejected claims.

Claims 13-16 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hrdina, in view of JP 11-166886 or Sugiyama (US 6,122,049). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 14 and 15 has been canceled without prejudice, rendering the rejection moot as applied to claims 14 and 15. Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection.

Claim 13 has been revised to include the feature of claim 11, which the Examiner indicated as including allowable subject matter. Claims 16 and 20 depend from claim 13 and thus are patentable along with claim 13. Applicants are not conceding the relevance of the references to the remaining features of the rejected claims.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Douglas P. Mueller, Reg. No. 30,300, at (612) 455-3804.



Dated: October 11, 2006

DPM/cy

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902-0902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By:

Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300